

### REMARKS

Claims 1-82 are pending in the application, with claims 1-5 and 15-18 being independent. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the relationship of connection between each of the TFTs. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 2-46, 48-, 55, 57-64, 66-73 and 75-82.

Claim 1 and its dependent claims 47, 56, 65 and 74 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kane (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,508). Applicant again requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection for the reasons presented in the prior response. In particular, Kane does not describe or suggest four TFTs interconnected in the manner recited in claim 1. For example, though the rejection asserts that the transistor N3 of Kane corresponds to the recited fourth TFT, this cannot be the case. As set forth in claim 1, the gate electrode of the fourth TFT is connected to a source or drain region of the second TFT and to a source or drain region of the third TFT. Thus, claim 1 recites that the gate electrode is connected to the connection between the second and third TFTs (node C in the marked up version of Kane's Fig. 7 that is included in the office action).

By contrast, the gate electrode of transistor N3 of Kane is connected to the connection between the transistors N1 and N4, which the rejection equates to the first and second TFTs recited in claim 1 (node B in the marked up version of Kane's Fig. 7 that is included in the office action). While the rejection asserts that the gate electrode of transistor N3 is connected to both node B and node C, this simply is not the case, as the gate electrode is not connected to node C. Accordingly, for at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In response to these arguments, the advisory action merely states that "applicant's arguments are not deemed to be persuasive, the prior art of record still reads on the broadly claimed invention." Applicant respectfully requests that, in the event that the Examiner chooses to maintain this rejection, the Examiner substantively address the arguments presented above and provide an explanation as to how the display device of claim 1 is believed to be shown by Kane in view of these arguments.

Applicant : Kazutaka INUKAI  
Serial No. : 09/886,148  
Filed : June 22, 2001  
Page : 26 of 26


Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-053001 / US5003

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$1,240 check for request for continued examination fee (\$790) and the Petition for Extension of Time fee (\$450). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/2/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331